DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 853 CS 205 014

AUTHOR Brand, Alice Glarden
TITLE The Therapeutic Benefits of Free or Informal Writing among Selected Eighth Graders.
PUB DATE [77]
NOTE 35p.; Research prepared at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Assertiveness; *Composition (Literary); Concept Formation; Educational Research; *Educational Therapy; Junior High Schools; Perception; Secondary Education; *Self Concept; *Self Evaluation; *Self Expression
IDENTIFIERS *Free Writing

ABSTRACT

Sixteen eighth grade students participated in a five-month experiment to determine whether informal writing has therapeutic effects on students' perceptions of how they view themselves and their personal problems. The students were selected on the basis of teacher opinion, learning ability, and student cooperation. Eight students were used as a control group in a regular English classroom; the remaining eight, comprising the experimental group, met daily for one class period with the investigator and submitted two finished themes every third week. Standardized tests and student writing samples were used to pretest and posttest both groups. Data were examined and rated in the three therapeutic areas studied--self-information, self-concept, and perceived problems--based on test information and scales designed for the investigation. Results indicated an increase in self-information, particularly regarding personal selves and families, with females in both groups more fully developing the ability to describe themselves in relation to others; a positive change in self-concept generally; and differences in problem perception, with females identifying and expressing more than males. The informal writing experience had partial and sometimes negative effects on the students, but these effects often anticipated positive therapeutic change and psychosocial growth. (A sample form to categorize student self-information is appended.) (AEA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED173253

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE THERAPEUTIC BENEFITS OF FREE OR INFORMAL WRITING AMONG SELECTED EIGHTH GRADERS

Alice Glarden Brand

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Alice Glarden Brand

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS205014

The Therapeutic Benefits of Free or Informal Writing Among Selected Eighth Graders

Alice Glarden Brand

The psychological benefits of writing have long been recognized. Aristotle wrote of the cathartic effects of poetry, and Freud hypothesized that psychoanalysis and poetry shared the unconscious meterials of dreams and fantasies. Early expressive therapists Jung (1922) and Rank (1932) in many ways equated creative expression with psychological health. Later humanists (e.g., Jourard, 1964; May, 1969) espoused the salutary effects of self-affirming written expression to heighten awareness and promote self-help. Many forms of written expression have been profitably employed as an adjunct therapeutic medium in the past decade: poetry therapy (Leedy, 1969); diary and journal keeping (Progoff, 1975); autobiography (Greening, 1977); correspondence (Bastien & Jacobs, 1974); and cognitive writing techniques (Ellis, 1976).

But even before these developments, the "psychologistic" turn of thought had found a place in education through the progressive education and mental hygiene movements of the 1930's. Because English educators, in particular, recognized that creative writing provided a vehicle for self-expression and, in fact, possessed psychologically liberating qualities, their interest lay with its broad therapeutic values (La Brant, 1936; Mearns, 1926). The national need for psychological services beyond the private clinical setting led

. 2

the humanists (e.g., Jersild, 1952; Moustakas, 1956) to view the teacher as central to students' emotional as well as intellectual development. Through the war years, English teachers made important use of the relationship between writing and underlying psychological tensions (e.g., Buckingham, 1941). Considered a guidance-related process, creative writing was frequently linked with such terms as "therapy," "personal adjustment," and "tension release" (Burrows, 1952; Cooper, 1951). At the Dartmouth Conference of 1966, creative writing was again appreciated for its contributions to personal stability, to the deeper regions of personality development, and to an entire range of inner satisfactions (Dixon, 1967).

Consonant with the personal growth paradigm endorsed at Dartmouth, the educational reform movement of the last decade elevated creative expression to a position as important as--or perhaps more important than--traditional academics (Alschuler, 1969; Weinstein & Fantini, 1970). The principles of psychological education made the teachers' therapeutic work a practical requirement. Since teachers do manage situations in which psychotherapeutic relationships are inevitable, the psychologically alert or well-trained teacher is in a unique position to promote student psychological well-being and community mental health (Staines, 1970).

Clearly, public schools have been assigned broad therapeutic responsibilities through the years. Expressive writing has also been known to promote psychological growth and

. 3

health. The purpose of this research was to investigate whether school-based writing programs could be defended for their therapeutic gains. Therefore, the investigator evaluated whether an intensive free or informal writing program could generate therapeutic benefits for its participants. Specifically, does such a program lead to:

- growth in range and depth of self-information,
- favorable changes in self-concept, and
- decreases in the number and kinds of perceived problems?

Method

The Sample

A group of eight females and eight male students was selected from an eighth-grade English class in an urban-suburban intermediate school facility. The following criteria for selection were established:

1. Favorable responses to two questions asked of current content area teachers: (a) Have students or have they not been neutral or responsive to school writing experiences? (b) In your judgment, do these students display fairly typical adolescent behaviors?

2. Perusal of past grades in academic subjects and standardized test scores to corroborate baseline assumption that subjects were within the range of normal learning ability.

3. Students' willingness to meet for informal writing class in a small group setting.

. 4

Of the 16 students, four males and four females were randomly assigned to participate in the program. The remaining eight students, taking English in a regular class setting with another teacher, served as the control group.

At the outset of the program, the mean age of all subjects was between 13.4 and 14 years. Their mean IQ was 114 as measured by the Kuhlmann-Anderson Test (7th ed.) administered in fifth grade (1975). As measured by the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) administered in the sixth grade (1976), the language scores of the subjects generated a mean grade equivalent ot 8.7; the reading scores generated a mean grade equivalent of 8.8.

Program Description

In lieu of a regular English class grouping of typically 25 to 30 students, the eight participants met as a small group with the investigator for one class period of 44 minutes a day for five months. The daily program was loosely structured as follows:

1. Warm-up or stimulation phase to generate interest, develop mood, and create a need to write; whole group exchange of ideas and anecdotes to crystallize student thinking. Five-to-ten minute "Uninterrupted Sustained Silent Writing" (USSW); group or individual discussion (self-sponsored or teacher-sponsored); journal entry.

2. Central writing phase and/or satellite activities.

3. Follow-up activities: sharing (whole group; between peers; investigator/peer; oral/written).

. 5

The participating students engaged in two teacher-sponsored writing experiences weekly. These were moored around the above warm-ups, self-sponsored topics, or open-ended, teacher-sponsored themes. Two finished products per participating student were collected at approximately weeks 3,6,9, 12,15, and 18. The finished products as well as journal entries, notes, and drafts were viewed by the investigator as a basis for planning discussions, suggesting writing ideas, giving student credit, and generating teacher oral/written responses.

Measures of Therapeutic Change

The following data were collected from each of the experimental and control group subjects before and after the writing program:

1. Two writing samples based on the following topics: (a) What matters to me? What's important to me? (b) Who am I? How do I see myself? How do I feel about myself?

2. Self-Descriptions: (a) Name words that describe you; (b) Name three words that you think others use to describe you.

3. Tennessee Self-Concept Scale (TSCS, 1965).

4. Mooney Problem Check List (Mooney, 1950).

Data Organization

Data from the above four instruments were then organized to provide information about the therapeutic benefits under investigation: self-information, self-concept, and perceived problems.

. 6

Measure of Self-Information. The source of data concerning self-information was the students' writing samples.[1] Each sample was examined and rated[2] by three trained readers. These judges were asked to evaluate:

- the range of student self-information, as measured by the number of Categories of Information[3] dealt with in the student writing (See Figure 1.).

- the degree of development of personal information as measured by its rank order of importance according to the Categories of Information (See Figure 1.).

- the depth of student self-information--that is, the extent to which student writing reflected mental/emotional self-examination--as rated on the following 10-point Level of Introspection scale:

10	9	8	7	6	/	5	4	3	2	1
the most introspective					mid					the total absence of

Measures of Self-Concept. Data concerning student self-concept was derived from four measures: The TSCS, the Self-Descriptions, and the Overall Positive Quality and Level of Self-Criticism of student writings. The TSCS profiled:

- self-criticism (Self-Criticism Score).

- overall self-esteem (Total Positive Score), as obtained from subscales measuring identity, self-satisfaction, and behavior as they pertain to the physical, moral and ethical, personal, family, and social selves.

. 7

- degree of integration of self-concept (Variability Scores).

- degree of certainty of self-perception (Distribution Scores).

In addition, the Self-Descriptions evaluated positivity[4] of self-concept. Each of the six student-generated terms was rated on a 7-point scale. A score of "1" represented a good trait; a "7" represented a bad trait.

The Overall Positive Quality of the writing was assessed by the readers according to the following scale:

5	4	3	2	1
High	Good	Fair	Low	None

Last, the Level of Self-Criticism of the writing, or the extent to which it reflected derogatory self-statements, was also rated by the evaluators on the following scale:

4	3	2	1
High	Moderate	Low	None

Measure of Perceived Problems. Students' perceived problems were derived from scores obtained on the following Mooney Problem Check List categories: (a) health and physical development; (b) school; (c) home and family; (d) money, work, the future; (e) boy and girl relations; (f) relations to people in general; and (g) self-centered concerns.

This instrument also provided space for narrative responses to the following three questions:

1. What problems are troubling you most? Write about

. 8

two or three of these if you care to.

2. Would you like to spend more time in school in trying to do something about some of your problems?

3. Would you like to talk to someone about some of your problems?

Results

The basic statistical procedure was a one-tailed analysis of variance test for repeated measures. The total number of subjects in all analyses was 16 (4 males and 4 females in each of the experimental and control groups). The three factors considered in the analyses were condition (experimental/control), sex (female/male), and time (pre/post). The convention of accepting an .05 level of significance was used. Because of the extreme smallness of the sample, probabilities near the .10 level were reported to indicate statistical trends or directionality.

Growth in Self-Information

The results demonstrated an increase in range of self-information. Students in the experimental group incorporated into their writing significantly more Categories of Personal Information than did the control group ($F = 6.94$; $p < .025$) (See Table 1.).

Control subjects developed more fully in writing how they felt about themselves (Self-Satisfaction) in relation to their friends ($F = 6.63$; $p \leq .025$) than did experimental subjects. But they developed less fully their behavior in relation to others ($F = 6.95$; $p \leq .025$) and to their

. 9

personalities (F = 4.73; p <.1). On the other hand, participating students developed who they were (Identity) in terms of their personalities (F = 4.73; p < .1) more fully than did their nonparticipating counterparts. They also developed more fully who they were in terms of their recreational (F = 3.29; p <.1) and family (F = 5.14; p < .05) lives. These increases in selected areas of personal information also represent increases in self-information and are presented in Table 2.

Results indicated that experimental subjects were not significantly more introspective than control subjects. Contrary to expectations,the writings of all students tended to reflect less mental or emotional self-examination than was indicated at pretesting (F = 4. 65; p < .1).

Several other findings are worthy of note. Exclusive of time or grouping, the females developed more fully in writing their behavior (F = 3.75; p <.1) and identity (F = 3.95; p < .1) in relation to others than did the males and, inclusive of time, their identity in terms of their personalities (F = 3.05;p = .107). Over time, students tended to be less concerned about their behavior with regard to virtually all categories of self-information: work-money-future-possessions, school, recreation, others, their family and friends, and themselves. At the same time, they became more concerned with their feelings and identities in relation to these same categories.

. 10

Changes in Self-Concept

The TSCS, the Self-Descriptions, and the Level of Self-Criticism and Overall Positive Quality of student writings generated data concerning student self-concept. While no significant difference was found on the major TSCS scale that measures overall self-esteem (Total Positive Score), an important trend was observed on selected Positive Scores which constitute the Total Positive Score. Female participants tended to become less satisfied with themselves over the five months than did the other three groups ($F = 3.57$; $p < .1$). They also grew more doubtful about their behavior ($F = 4.14$; $p < .1$), and felt more inadequate about their personalities ($F = 3.03$; $p = .108$) than did the other three groups.

Further, the consistency of self-perception across the positive scores (Variability Scores) indicated that, over time, the self-concepts of female participants became less integrated than those of the three other groups ($F = 4.40$; $p < .1$). Specifically, they experienced significantly greater inconsistency among their physical, moral and ethical, personal, family and social selves (Column Variability) ($F = 14.90$; $p < .01$).

Over time, all students became significantly more self-critical as measured by the TSCS ($F = 12.71$; $p < .01$), and made significantly more hedging (Distribution 3) responses ($F = 5.18$; $p < .05$). However, the males made significantly fewer "mildly definite" (Distribution 4) responses ($F = 11.15$; $p < .01$) and discernibly more "most definite"

. 11

(Distribution 5) responses (F = 3.01; p = .109) than did the females (See Table 3.).

The self-descriptions provided additional information about self-concept. When the six descriptive terms were combined for analysis, it was found that, over time, all students described themselves more favorably (F = 17.76; p < .01). At the pretesting, experimental subjects tended to describe themselves and see others as describing them more positively than did the control subjects. By postintervention however, the experimental subjects were not so positive on this measure as were the control subjects (F = 4.01; p < .1).

The sex factor seemed to govern other important differences in self-descriptions. For example, females from both groups described themselves more negatively than male subjects did on the first (F = 8.55; p < .025) and second (F = 4.24; p <.1) self terms, but more positively than the males on the third self term (F = 4.57; p < .1).

Also, at the pretest, the males described themselves (Self Terms Combined) less positively on the whole than they thought others described them (Other Terms Combined), while the females pictured themselves (Self Terms Combined) more favorably than they thought others did (Other Terms Combined). By the posttesting, this directionality was reversed: that is, the males described themselves more favorably (Self Terms Combined) than they thought others did (Other Terms Combined), and the females pictured themselves (Self Terms Combined) less favorably than they thought

others described them (Other Terms Combined) ($F = 19.88$; $p \leq .001$) (See Table 4.).

Finally, all students' writings became less self-critical with time ($F = 4.17$; $p < .1$). However, the experimental group writings became more positive than did those of the control group ($F = 4.00$; $p < .1$).

Differences in Perceived Problems

The third research question concerned students' perceived problems. A significant difference was found in one type of problem experienced by student participants. Over time, experimental group females expressed significantly more concerns about other people, while their male counterparts reported experiencing significantly fewer problems of this kind, and the responses of the control group remained stable ($F = 4.80$; $p < .05$).

Over the five-month interval, all females reported significantly more problems than did the males ($F = 14.95$; $p < .01$) and, in particular, more problems with school ($F = 6.15$; $p < .05$), money, work, future ($F = 4.84$; $p < .05$) and other people ($F = 3.33$; $p < .1$) (See Table 5.).

Students' responses to narrative Questions 2 and 3 suggested that all females were more willing to share their problems. However, unlike the control group females, the female participants expressed a continued willingness to work on them in school. The males--particularly those in the control group--did not want to talk about their problems with anyone or work on them in school.

. 13

Summary of Findings

The experimental intervention, that is, the intensive writing program, had the following significant effects:

1. It promoted an increase in the range of student self-information.

2. It promoted the development in writing of selected areas of student self-information. While the writings of both experimental and control groups reflected an increase in development in public spheres of self-information (friends), the writings of student participants reflected fuller development in the more private spheres (personal selves and families).

3. Student participants wrote more positively about themselves in the work samples than did the control group, but described themselves less favorably.

4. Female participants grew less satisfied with themselves and more doubtful about their behavior and their personalities. Similarly, the self-concept of female participants became significantly more inconsistent. However, while experimental group females sustained a significant increase in problems relating to other people, they reported more sustained willingness than the three other groups to work on problems in school.

Several significant differences emerged as a function of sex. For example:

1. Regardless of grouping, the males generally saw themselves more positively than they saw others as describing them, and the females saw themselves less positively

. 14

than they thought others did.

2. The males responded with more certainty about themselves than did the females.

3. In their writings, the females indicated greater involvement than did the males with their personalities and other people.

4. The females reported experiencing more problems with school, money, work, the future, and others than did the males, who actually expressed fewer problems of these kinds. However, the females reported more interest in sharing their problems than the males, who expressed a continued reluctance to deal with their problems.

Finally, male and female subjects in both groups showed certain changes over the five-month time period. Specifically:

1. Students developed their feelings and identities more fully in their writing than they did their behavior.

2. Students tended to become more noncommittal in their responses on standardized tests.

3. Students described themselves more positively.

4. Students became more self-critical according to the TSCS,[5] but less self-critical and less introspective in their writings.

The Meaning of Therapeutic Change

The results of the present research indicate that the intervention had partial and inconsistent therapeutic effects on its participants as a whole and some negative effects on its female participants. However, inconclusive or negative

. . . . 15

change is not, in itself, symptomatic of permanent adjustment difficulties, nor does it necessarily mean that the program was "antitherapeutic." Such negative changes can be interpreted as "good" if they signify a point in a growth process, or "bad" if they signify a stage leading to progressive maladjustment.

Psychosocial growth does imply positive therapeutic change. But the ultimate benefits of therapy may well depend on a set of initial changes in a negative direction. Life-cycle theorists support the contention that inherent in the human maturational process is a series of built-in stages or crisis points (e.g., Erikson, 1959; Hall, 1904). Surely, puberty is one of these predictable crisis points in which adolescents temporarily experience some storm and stress before maturing to the next stage of life. Thus, some of the so called "negative" emotions may, in fact, be important for positive, long-term growth.

Personal construct theory (Kelly, 1955) also considers the negative changes that occur during the course of psychotherapy. According to Kelly, the first stage of therapy is marked by a breakdown of established patterns of constructs, that is, the ways in which individuals attach meaning to the world and to themselves. These constructs no longer provide their holders with a clear basis for self-interpretation, and, as a result, a temporary thought-disorderedness or a disconnnectedness of self takes place (Bannister & Fransella, 1971).

. 16

This personal disorganization may be seen as roughly analogous to the adolescent discontinuity that precedes the establishment of an adult identity in our society. As part of this process, the familiar personal constructs now become questionable, contradictory, even warring. This disturbing but largely temporary personal disorientation is, in a sense, a prerequisite to the reconstruction of self as an adult.

In keeping with Kelly's views, the outcomes of this study also imply that the duration of the intervention was insufficient for the therapeutic cycle to complete itself; that is, the time period was too brief to allow the loosened constructs to realign themselves and reinterpretation of self to occur. Though the hypothesized therapeutic benefits--that is, increased self-information, a more positive self-concept, and decreased felt problems--were not uniformly demonstrated, the negative changes observed in the females suggest that the program may have stimulated a self-inquiry that would ultimately lead to these psychosocial growths.

Sex differences were observed in several measures of student self-concept and perceived problems. For instance, all females described themselves more negatively and expressed more problems, and females in the program experienced significant losses in self-concept. Since biological evidence indicates that females generally precede males into puberty, females are apt to enter this intense stress or crisis situation earlier. Therefore, the females in this study may have

. 17

already been experiencing some level of emotional chaos. If the intensive writing program is viewed as a form of therapy, female participants may also be seen as moving through some of the experiences associated with the initial stages of therapy. Accordingly, the intervention may have accelerated and deepened this "natural" psychosocial upheaval.

There was another indication that students were moving through a transitional period. A pattern in students' writings emerged whereby feeling and identity self-statements were replacing physical/behavioral statements. By attending to the feeling and being aspects of themselves, students appeared to be shifting attention from what they were doing to observing what they were doing. This process also implies an increasing capacity to get closer to self through word symbols that take on continually more abstract qualities. In effect, students were relying more and more upon internal evidence in processing information about their environment and themselves. This finding may therefore be interpreted as a movement in student thinking toward more adult modes.

Implications for Further Research

The present study provides some answers about the role of creative writing in personal growth, but at the same time raises a number of important questions:

1. The concept of affective education has cycled in and out of professional favor over the years. Given institutional limitations and institutional ambivalence toward shouldering affective responsibilities, are personal growth

. 18

writing and school-sponsored writing inherently incompatible within our secondary schools? How might this question be more rigorously examined?

2. An underlying assumption of this research was that all students stand to gain from sustained encounters with expressive writing. However, individuals are known to be oriented toward different learning styles. If affective education is a realistic possibility, how might public schools miter teaching practices with students' preferred modes of expression in order to promote psychological health? Given a student's expressed need for therapeutic engagement, or writing as a student's chosen medium of expression, what kinds of psychosocial growths could accrue from a personal writing intervention?

3. That sex and development were so powerful a determinant of student response in this study suggests that early adolescents may be in transition between developmental stages when expressive writing might be of benefit. Are there some developmental stages of greater responsiveness to therapeutic writing experiences than others? How does the generally superior verbal ability of females affect the facility with this kind of writing during various developmental periods?

4. Tension reduction is probably the single most frequently reported therapeutic outcome of writing (e.g., Emily Dickinson, cited in Leedy, 1973), but it is a surprisingly underdeveloped area of systematic inquiry. What are the physiological relationships between the writing process and tension release? What are the short- and long-range effects of

. 19

tension-reducing writing on insight, problem solving, self-esteem, and the form and substance of the writing itself? What are the implications of this procedure for such stress-related conditions as hypertension, heart disease, general irritability, headaches?

Conclusion

The lack of clear, positive statistical results in this research suggests that the relationship between therapeutic writing and the secondary school English program is a complex one. Indeed, the therapeutic impact of the intervention interacts with a variety of institutional and personal factors. Perhaps a major finding of the present study is that without deep student engagement and institutional cooperation, the therapeutic benefits of school-based personal writing cannot reasonably be expected to compete with powerful sex and developmental influences.

But if we write, we know that it does meet special psychological needs. Writing is often the start of and many times a complete therapeutic act in itself. Therefore, one must wonder why the writing we know in principle and from practice is so often a far cry from what students actually experience.

. 20

References

Alschuler, A. Psychological education. Journal for Humanistic Psychology, 1969, 9, 1-16.

Bannister, D., & Fransella, F. Inquiring man: The theory of personal constructs. Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1971.

Bastien, S., & Jacobs, A. Dear Sheila: An experimental study of the effectiveness of written communication as a form of psychotherapy. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42(1), 151.

Buckingham, L.H. Creative writing based upon experience: Some psychological values. English Journal, 1941, 30, 553-557.

Burrows, A.T. Writing as therapy. Elementary English, 1952, 29, 135-138; 149.

Cooper, J.W. Creative writing as an emotional outlet. Elementary English, 1951, 28, 21-23.

Dixon, J. Growth through English: A report based on the Dartmouth seminar, 1966. Reading, England: National Association for the Teaching of English, 1967.

Ellis, A. Rational self help form. New York: Institute for Rational Living, 1976.

Erikson, E. Identity and the life cycle: Selected papers. In Psychological issues. New York: International Universities Press, 1959.

Fitts, W.H. Tennessee self concept scale manual. Nashville, Tenn.: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.

Greening, T.C. The uses of autobiography. In W. Anderson (Ed.), Therapy and the arts: Tools of consciousness. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

Hall, G.S. Adolescence: Its psychology and its relations to physiology, anthropology, sociology, sex, crime, religion, and education. New York: Appleton, 1904.

Jersild, A.T. In search of self; an exploration of the role of the school in promoting self-understanding. New York: Teachers College Press, 1952.

. 21

Jourard, S.M. The transparent self (2nd ed.). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold,1971. (Originally published, 1964.)

Jung, C.G. On the relation of analytical psychology to poetry. In J. Campbell (Ed.), and R.F.C. Hull (trans.), The portable Jung. New York: Viking Press, 1972. (Originally published, 1922.)

Kelly, G. The psychology of personal constructs: Clinical diagnosis and psychotherapy (Vol. 2). New York: W.W. Norton, 1955.

LaBrant, L. The psychological basis for creative writing. English Journal (High School Ed.), 1936, 25, 292-301.

Leedy, J.J. (Ed.). Poetry therapy: The use of poetry in the treatment of emotional disorders. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1969.

Leedy, J.J. (Ed.). Poetry, the healer. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1973.

May, R. Love and will. New York: Norton, 1969.

Mearns, H. Creative youth; how a school environment set free the creative spirit. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, Page, 1926.

Mooney Problem Check Lists. Junior High School Form.: New York: The Psychological Corporation, 1950.

Moustakas,C.E. The teacher and the child. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

Progoff, I. At a journal workshop: The basic text and guide for using the intensive journal. New York:Dialogue House, 1975.

Rank, O. Art and artist. New York: Tudor Publishers, 1932.

Staines, J.W. The teacher's therapeutic role in ordinary classroom situations. Australian Psychologist, 1970, 5(1), 9-24.

Tennessee self concept scale. Nashville, Tenn.: Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.

Weinstein, G., & Fantini, M.D. (Eds.). Toward humanistic education: A curriculum of affect. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

. 22

Footnotes

1. The two specimens collected prior to the intervention and the two collected after were each treated as one extended work sample.

2. On all assessments, interrater reliability was established by consensus between at least any two of the three readers or by calculating mean ratings.

3. Self-Information was classified according to a schema adapted from the Mooney Problem Check List and Tennessee Self-Concept Scale. Friends, recreational selves, possessions, and impersonal categories were added to the scales of these instruments after pilot study revealed need for same.

4. Positivity values were derived for every student-written term from a questionnaire administered in an unrelated situation (a science class) in which individual subjects rated each term on the following scale:

Good Trait			Neutral Trait			Bad Trait
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

   The individual ratings were then averaged for each term and the resulting value applied to the term when it appeared on the students' self-descriptions.

5. According to Fitts (1965), moderately high scores indicate a normal healthy openness and capacity for self-criticism (p. 2).

. 23

Table 1

Summary Data and Analysis of Variance: Number of Categories of Personal Information Identified in Student Writings

	Pre $\bar{X}$	Post $\bar{X}$	F
Exp.	7.00	8.00	6.94*
Con.	7.13	5.88	

*$p < .025$

Table 2
Summary Data and Analysis of Variance: Levels of Development of Selected Categories of Personal Information in Student Writings

		Pre $\bar{X}$	Post $\bar{X}$	F
Family Identity	Exp.	1.88	3.00	5.14**
	Con.	3.88	1.00	
Friends Self-Satisfaction	Exp.	1.88	2.63	6.63***
	Con.	1.00	5.88	
Personality Identity	Exp.	2.63	6.00	4.65*
	Con.	5.00	3.13	
Behavior	Exp.	2.38	2.38	4.73*
	Con.	5.13	1.00	
Recreation Identity	Exp.	1.00	4.88	3.29*
	Con.	1.88	2.00	
People in General Behavior	Exp.	1.00	1.50	6.95***
	Con.	4.63	1.88	

* $p < .1$
** $p < .05$
*** $p \leq .025$

Table 3
Summary Data and Analysis of Variance:
Tennessee Self Concept Scale

		Pre $\bar{X}$		Post $\bar{X}$		F
		Male	Female	Male	Female	
Positive Scores	Exp.	119.00	109.00	121.00	98.75	3.57*
Self-Satisfaction	Con.	115.75	110.75	109.00	111.00	
Behavior	Exp.	110.25	107.75	112.00	94.00	4.14*
	Con.	114.00	109.00	111.50	109.50	
Personal Self	Exp.	69.25	67.75	69.50	61.25	3.03
	Con.	71.00	68.00	67.00	68.25	
Total Variability	Exp.	40.50	43.50	37.50	54.50	4.40*
	Con.	36.25	42.00	40.00	40.00	
Column Variability	Exp.	24.50	24.50	21.00	33.00	14.90***
	Con.	20.25	26.25	25.00	22.25	
Self-Criticism	Exp.	32.38		35.25		12.71***
	Con.	30.75		35.00		
Distribution 5	Male	13.00		16.25		3.01
	Female	11.63		11.00		
Distribution 4	Male	28.63		19.25		11.15***
	Female	26.75		27.38		
Distribution 3	Exp.	23.50		26.25		5.18**
	Con.	25.13		33.25		

* $p < .1$
** $p < .05$
*** $p < .01$

Table 4
Summary Data and Analysis of Variance:
Student Self-Descriptions

Terms		Pre $\bar{X}$		Post $\bar{X}$		F
First self	Male	3.85		3.03		8.55***
	Female	2.79		3.39		
Second Self	Male	3.51		2.63		4.24*
	Female	3.15		3.84		
Third Self	Male	2.71		3.24		4.57*
	Female	2.83		2.54		
Self/Other Combined	Exp.	3.00		2.51		17.76****
	Con.	3.25		2.28		
		Self	Other	Self	Other	
	Exp.	2.96	3.03	2.65	2.37	4.01*
	Con.	3.32	3.18	2.22	2.34	
	Male	3.36	2.96	2.30	2.53	19.88*****
	Female	2.92	3.25	2.56	2.18	

* $p < .1$
** $p < .05$
*** $p < .025$
**** $p < .01$
***** $p \leq .001$

Table 5
Summary Data and Analysis of Variance:
Student Perceived Problems

		Pre $\bar{X}$		Post $\bar{X}$		F
Total Number	Male	19.63		16.13		14.95***
	Female	20.38		25.25		
Money, Work the Future	Male	4.13		2.63		4.84**
	Female	3.88		4.50		
School	Male	4.63		2.75		6.15**
	Female	2.38		3.75		
People in General	Male	2.63		2.00		3.33*
	Female	3.00		3.63		
		Male	Female	Male	Female	
	Exp.	2.75	3.00	1.50	4.50	4.80**
	Con.	2.50	3.00	2.50	2.75	

* $p < .1$
** $p < .05$
*** $p < .01$

Figure Caption

Figure 1. Form Used to Categorize Student Self-Information.

Student _____

Title of Composition_____ Date _____ Reader_____

CATEGORIES OF INFORMATION: Rank in order from dominant category, 9, to the next dominant category, 8, and so on. 1 represents absence of category.

Personal	Identity[1]	Self-Satisfaction[2]	Behavior[3]
Physical Self (health & physical development)	___	___	___
School Self	___	___	___
Family Self (home & family)	___	___	___
Money, Work, Future, Possessions	___	___	___
Social Self			
(a) friends	___	___	___
(b) boy/girl relations	___	___	___
(c) relations to people in general	___	___	___
Personal Self (self-centered, moral-ethical concerns)	___	___	___
Recreational Self	___	___	___
Impersonal			

[1] What student is as student sees self.

[2] How student feels about self.

[3] How student acts.